

Original citation:

Francis, Leslie J., Robbins, Mandy and Cargas, Sarita. (2012). The perceiving process and mystical orientation : an empirical study in psychological type theory among participants at the parliament of the world's religions. *Studies in Spirituality*, Vol.22 pp. 341-352.

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/52699>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes the work of researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2143/SIS.22.0.2182858>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

warwick**publications**wrap

highlight your research

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/lib-publications>

The perceiving process and mystical orientation: an empirical study in psychological type
theory among participants at the Parliament of the World's Religions

Leslie J. Francis*

The University of Warwick, England, UK

Mandy Robbins

Glyndŵr University, Wales, UK

Sarita Cargas

Webster University, St Louis, Missouri, USA

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Institute of Education

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Notes on contributors

Professor Leslie J Francis is Professor of Religions and Education within the Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of Warwick, England, UK and Canon Theologian at Bangor Cathedral, Wales, UK.

Dr Mandy Robbins is Senior Lecturer within the Division of Psychology, Institute for Health, Medical Science and Society, Glyndŵr University, Wales, UK.

Dr Sarita Cargas is Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences Adjunct Faculty, Webster University, St Louis, Missouri, USA.

Abstract

A sample of 580 participants attending the Parliament of the World's Religions in Barcelona 2004 completed the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale together with a measure of psychological type (the Francis Psychological Type Scales) in order to test the thesis based on Christopher Ross' work that intuitive types would record significantly higher scores of mystical orientation in comparison with sensing types. The data supported Ross' theory, and also added to the growing body of evidence supporting the relevance of psychological type theory for shaping testable hypotheses within the empirical psychology of religion.

Keywords: psychological type, mysticism, Francis Psychological Type Scales, psychology, religion, Parliament of the World's Religions.

Introduction

During the past decade Jungian psychological type theory has become more visible within the empirical psychology of religion, as a growing body of evidence has established the power of type theory to predict individual differences in religious expression, experience and belief (for reviews see Francis¹ and Ross²). A particularly important contribution to theory in this field has been made by Christopher Ross³ work on the perceiving process. Ross has argued that the perceiving process (sensing and intuition) is of crucial significance in shaping individual differences in religiosity.

According to Jungian theory, the perceiving process is the irrational process. It is concerned with ways in which people gather information, not with how they evaluate that information. Evaluation is the role of the rational process, styled in Jungian theory as the judging process (see Jung⁴). The two functions of the perceiving process are styled sensing and intuition. Sensing types focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical. They tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. Intuitive types focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perceptions from the senses are not as valuable as information gained as indirect association and concepts impact on their perceptions.

Focusing on the perceiving process, Ross, Weiss and Jackson⁵ found intuitives contrasted to sensors in terms of greater comfort with regard to complexity of religious belief,

¹ L.J. Francis, 'Psychological type theory and religious and spiritual experience', in: M. De Souza, L.J. Francis, J.O'Higgins-Norman, & D.G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing*, Dordrecht: Springer, 2009, 125-146.

² C.F.J. Ross, 'Jungian typology and religion: A perspective from North America', in: *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 2, (2011), 165-191.

³ C.F.J. Ross, 'The intuitive function and religious orientation', in: *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 37, (1992), 83-103.

⁴ C.G. Jung, *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

⁵ C.F.J. Ross, D. Weiss, & L.M. Jackson, 'The relation of Jungian psychological type to religious attitudes and practices', in: *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 6, (1996), 263-279.

while sensors tended to be more definite in regard to what counted as religious to them. Sensors evidenced firmer boundaries between what was secular and what was sacred. Intuitives showed a more welcoming attitude toward religious change, viewing new insights as essential for a healthy religious life and 'narrow minded religion' as a significant problem. Sensing types by contrast saw religious change as a problem, and change in personal faith as an indication of weakness. Ross and Jackson⁶ concluded in their study of Catholics that the pattern of responses to individual items suggested that religion functioned in different ways for sensing and for intuitive types. According to this study religion tended to function as a guide to right living for sensing types, and as a source of insight for intuitive types. Studies of college students by Burris and Ross⁷ confirmed the relevance of the perceiving preference of sensing or intuition for orientation to religion, even among less religiously committed groups.

In a subsequent paper, Francis and Ross⁸ (p. 95) set out to examine differences between sensing types and intuitive types with regard to preferences in Christian spirituality, and to test the following two specific hypotheses.

As consistent with a preference for more traditional patterns of worship and more conservative forms of belief, it is hypothesised that sensors will display a greater preference for traditional expressions of Christian spirituality (like church attendance and personal prayer) in comparison with intuitives, while intuitives will display a greater openness to the experiential aspects of spirituality (like witnessing a fine sunset or being inspired by a star filled sky) in comparison with sensors. (p. 95)

⁶ C.F.J. Ross, & L.M. Jackson, Orientation to religion and Jungian type preference among Canadian Catholics. (Unpublished paper presented to American Psychological Association Convention, Toronto, 1993).

⁷ C. Burris, C., & C.F.J. Ross, 'Jungian type and religious orientation: Extrinsic, intrinsic, quest or immanence. (Unpublished paper presented to American Psychological Association Convention, Toronto, 1996).

⁸ L.J. Francis, & C.F.J. Ross, 'The perceiving function and Christian spirituality: Distinguishing between sensing and intuition', in: *Pastoral Sciences* 16 (1997), 93-103.

Ross' general theory that the perceiving process (sensing or intuition) plays a central role in predicting preferred ways of being religious or expressing religiosity, together with the findings presented by Francis and Ross⁹ that intuitive types show a higher appreciation than sensing types of experiential spirituality, leads to the clear hypothesis that intuitive types will record higher scores than sensing types on indices of mystical orientation. A small series of studies has set out to test Ross' thesis regarding the connection between the perceiving process and mystical orientation using either the Mystical Orientation Scale (MOS) proposed by Francis and Loudon¹⁰ or the Short Index of Mystical Orientation (SIMO) proposed by Francis and Loudon¹¹. These two instruments were designed to operationalised the definition of mysticism proposed by Happold¹² who developed and extended the work of William James¹³. According to Happold the seven defining characteristics of mysticism are ineffability, noesis, transience, passivity, consciousness of the oneness of everything, a sense of tirelessness, and true ego. In the longer instrument, the MOS, Francis and Loudon¹⁴ provided three items to access each of the seven components. The shorter instrument, the SIMO is less well balanced.

In a first study designed to test the relationship between psychological type and mystical orientation, Francis and Loudon¹⁵ administered the SIMO together with the Keirsey Temperament Sorter¹⁶ to a sample of 100 student and adult churchgoers. Their data supported

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ L.J. Francis, & S.H. Loudon, 'The Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale (MOS): A study among Roman Catholic priests', in: *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 11 (2000), 99-116.

¹¹ L.J. Francis, L. J., & S.H. Loudon, 'A short index of mystical orientation (SIMO): A study among Roman Catholic priests', in: *Pastoral Psychology* 53 (2004), 49-51.

¹² F.C. Happold, *Mysticism: A study and an anthology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.

¹³ W. James, *The Varieties of religious experience*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.

¹⁴ Francis & Loudon, 'The Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale'

¹⁵ L.J. Francis, & S.H. Loudon, 'Mystical orientation and psychological type: A study among student and adult churchgoers, in: *Transpersonal Psychology Review* 4 (2000), 36-42.

¹⁶ D. Keirsey, *Please understand me: 2*, Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis, 1998.

the hypothesis based on Ross' work: intuitive types reported a significantly higher mean score of mystical orientation compared with sensing types.

In a second study, Francis¹⁷ administered the SIMO together with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator¹⁸ to a sample of 543 participants attending workshops concerned with personality and spirituality. Their data did not support the hypothesis based on Ross' work. There was no significant difference between the mean scores of mystical orientation recorded by sensing types and by intuitive types.

In a third study, Francis, Village, Robbins, and Ineson¹⁹ administered the MOS together with the Francis Psychological Type Scales²⁰ to a sample of 318 guests who had stayed at a Benedictine Abbey. Their data supported the hypothesis based on Ross' work: intuitive types reported higher mean scores of mystical orientation in comparison with sensing types.

The interpretation of the findings from these three studies is complex for three reasons: the samples are clearly quite different; two different (although related) measures of mystical orientation were employed; three different measures of psychological type were employed. The aim of the present study is to build on the previous work by replicating two aspects of the third study in the series, reported by Francis, Village, Robbins and Ineson²¹, in the sense of employing the MOS alongside the Francis Psychological Type Scales. The radical difference in the new study, however, concerns the nature of the sample. The new study draws on the participants at the Parliament of the World's Religions in Barcelona in

¹⁷ L.J. Francis, 'Psychological type and mystical orientation: Anticipating individual differences within congregational life', in: *Pastoral Sciences* 21 (2002), 77-99.

¹⁸ I.B. Myers, & M.H. McCaulley, *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*, Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1985.

¹⁹ L.J. Francis, A. Village, M. Robbins, & K. Ineson, 'Mystical orientation and psychological type: An empirical study among guests staying at a Benedictine Abbey', in: *Studies in Spirituality* 17 (2007), 207-223.

²⁰ L.J. Francis, *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005.

²¹ Francis, Village, Robbins, & Ineson, 'Mystical orientation and psychological type'.

2004 and so includes individuals associated with a wide range of religious and spiritual traditions.

The Parliament of the World's Religions has its origins in an initiative taken in Chicago in 1893 and repeated in Chicago a century later in 1993²². Subsequent Parliaments were held in 1999 (Cape Town, South Africa), 2004 (Barcelona, Spain), and 2009 (Melbourne, Australia). The ethos of the Parliament was summed up in a document that emerged from the 1993 meeting, *Toward a global ethic*.²³ Here the following claim was made.

We affirm that a common set of values is found in the teachings of religions, and that these form the basis of a global ethic ... There already exist ancient guidelines for human behaviour which are found in the teaching of the religions of the world and which are the condition for a sustainable world order. (p. 2)

According to the Executive Summary, the 1993 Parliament achieved its aim of attracting support from across the globe and from across a wide range of religious and spiritual traditions. That Parliament was attended by around 5,500 individuals drawn from 55 nations and representing around 60 religions and spiritual traditions²⁴.

Method

Procedure

The substantial questionnaire was distributed to participants attending the 2004 convention of

²² R.H. Seager, The two Parliaments, the 1893 original and the centennial of 1993: A historians view, in: W. Teasdale & G. Cairns (Eds), *The community of religions: Voices and images of the Parliament of the World's Religions*, New York: Continuum 1996, 22-33.

²³ Parliament, *Toward a global ethic: An initial declaration*, Chicago, Illinois: Council for the Parliament of the World's Religions, 1993.

²⁴ Parliament, *Executive summary: 1993 Parliament of the World's Religions*, Chicago, Illinois: Council for the Parliament of the World's Religions, 1993.

the Parliament of the World's Religions convened in Barcelona by representatives of the International Interfaith Centre at Oxford (IIC). Participants were assured of complete confidentiality and anonymity, and invited to approach the team at the IIC table in the exhibition hall if they had questions about the project. Those who returned completed questionnaires to the IIC table received a free rucksack. A total of 580 questionnaires were returned that included no missing data for the variables under consideration.

Sample

The 580 respondents comprised: 229 men, 342 women, and 9 individuals of undisclosed sex; 29 individuals under the age of twenty, 102 in their twenties, 64 in their thirties, 98 in their forties, 145 in their fifties, 108 in their sixties, 31 aged seventy or over, and 3 of undisclosed age. Of the ten religious traditions listed in the questionnaire, 284 individuals self-identified as Christians, 37 as Hindus, 35 as Buddhists, 22 as Muslims, 21 as Sikhs, 21 as Pagans, 19 as Baha'is, 14 as Jews, 5 as Jains, and 4 as Zoroastrians; the remaining 118 participants wrote in a very wide range of religious or spiritual identities. Nearly half of the participants in the survey were born in the USA (273), with the next largest group coming from Spain, the host nation (60), UK (44), Canada (27), and India (29). The remaining participants identified a total of 60 other countries.

Measures

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales²⁵. This 40-item instrument comprises four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). Recent studies have demonstrated this instrument to function well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008)

²⁵ L.J. Francis, 'Faith and psychology'.

reported alpha coefficients of .83 for the EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale.

Mystical orientation was assessed by the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale²⁶. This 21-item measure contains three items to access each of the seven key characteristics of mysticism identified by Happold²⁷: ineffability, noesis, transiency, passivity, consciousness of the oneness of everything, sense of timelessness, and true ego.

Data analysis

The data were analysed by the SPSS package, using the correlation, reliability and t-test routines. The scientific literature concerned with psychological type has developed a highly distinctive way of presenting type-related data. The conventional format of 'type tables' has been employed in the present paper to allow the findings of this study to be located easily alongside other relevant studies in the literature.

Results

The first step in data analysis concerned an examination of the internal consistency reliability of the Francis Psychological Type Scales. Satisfactory alpha coefficients²⁸ were reported for all scales: EI, .79; SN, .65; TF, .64; JP, .71.

The type distribution of the sample is presented in table 1 in the conventional format.

-insert table 1-

In this study, the participants displayed preferences for introversion (54%) over extraversion (46%), for intuition (57%) over sensing (43%), for feeling (62%) over thinking (38%), and for judging (73%) over perceiving (27%). The most frequently occurring types were ESFJ (13%), INFJ (12%), INTJ (11%) and ISTJ (10%).

²⁶ Francis & Loudon, 'The Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale'.

²⁷ F.C. Happold, 'Mysticism'.

²⁸ L.J. Cronbach, 'Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests', in: *Psychometrika* 16 (1951), 297-334.

The second step in the data analysis comprised an evaluation of the measure of mystical orientation. Since 13 of the respondents omitted this section, the following analyses are based on a reduced sample of 567. Table 2 presents the 21 items of the Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale, together with the item rest-of-test correlations and the proportions of the respondents who rated the importance of the experience for their own faith a four or a

- insert table 2 about here -

five on the five-point scale. The scale achieved the satisfactory alpha coefficient of .93. All the 21 items contributed positively to the homogeneity of the scale, with item rest-of-test correlations ranging between .43 and .73.

Table 3 presents the mean scale scores recorded on the Mystical Orientation Scale according to the dichotomous preferences. These data supported the hypothesis based on

- insert table 3 about here -

Ross' work: intuitive types recorded higher mean scores of mystical orientation in comparison with sensing types.

Table 3 also demonstrates that the perceiving process is not the only aspect of psychological type associated with significant differences in mystical orientation scores. Given the complex interactions within the component parts of psychological type theory, table 4 attempts to clarify the situation by examining the mean scores of mystical orientation according to the eight dominant and auxiliary pairs. In this table mystical orientation scores have been ranked in descending order. What is revealing in this table is that the three highest scores all include intuition (as either dominant or auxiliary) and the three lowest scores all include sensing (as either dominant or auxiliary).

Conclusion

This study set out to build on previous research that had sought to test the hypothesis derived from Ross' work: that intuitive types would record higher scores of mystical orientation in comparison with sensing types. This new study deliberately kept constant the measures employed by Francis, Village, Robbins, and Ineson²⁹ but replicated their work among a very different kind of sample. By drawing on participants attending the Parliament of the World's Religions the present study drew on data provided by members of a range of religious and spiritual traditions.

The data generated by this new study concurs with the findings of Francis and Loudon³⁰ and Francis, Village, Robbins and Ineson³¹ in support of Ross' thesis. One problem remains, however, namely to account for the discrepant findings provided by Francis³² (2002). Such a programme of research would establish whether any other studies replicated the findings of Francis³³ or whether these findings may be a random aberration. In accordance with general principles of scientific enquiry, further studies in this tradition are still needed in order to establish a fuller and more authoritative examination of the role of the perceiving process in nurturing the mystical orientation within a broad range of religious and spiritual traditions.

²⁹ Francis, Village, Robbins, & Ineson, 'Mystical orientation and psychological type'.

³⁰ Francis & Loudon, 'The Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale'.

³¹ Francis, Village, Robbins, & Ineson, 'Mystical orientation and psychological type'.

³² L.J. Francis, 'Psychological type and mystical orientation'.

³³ Ibid.

References

- Burris, C., & C.F.J. Ross, Jungian type and religious orientation: extrinsic, intrinsic, quest or immanence. (Unpublished paper presented to American Psychological Association Convention, Toronto, 1996).
- Cronbach, L.J., 'Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests', in: *Psychometrika* 16 (1951), 297-334.
- Francis, L.J., 'Psychological type and mystical orientation: Anticipating individual differences within congregational life', in: *Pastoral Sciences* 21 (2002), 77-99.
- Francis, L.J., *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005.
- Francis, L.J., 'Psychological type theory and religious and spiritual experience', in: M. De Souza, L.J. Francis, J.O'Higgins-Norman, & D.G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing*, Dordrecht: Springer, 2009, 125-146.
- Francis, L.J., C.L.Craig, & G. Hall, G., 'Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study', in: *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 23 (2008), 181-191.
- Francis, L. J., & S.H. Loudon, 'The Francis-Louden Mystical Orientation Scale (MOS): a study among Roman Catholic priests', in: *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 11 (2000a), 99-116.
- Francis, L. J., & S.H. Loudon, 'Mystical orientation and psychological type: a study among student and adult churchgoers', in: *Transpersonal Psychology Review* 4 (2000b), 36-42.
- Francis, L. J., & S.H. Loudon, 'A short index of mystical orientation (SIMO): A study among Roman Catholic priests', in: *Pastoral Psychology* 53 (2004), 49-51.

Francis, L.J., & C.F.J. Ross, 'The perceiving function and Christian spirituality:

Distinguishing between sensing and intuition', in: *Pastoral Sciences* 16 (2007), 93-103.

Francis, L.J., A.Village, M. Robbins, & K. Ineson, K. 'Mystical orientation and

psychological type: An empirical study among guests staying at a Benedictine Abbey', in: *Studies in Spirituality* 17 (2007), 207-223.

Happold, F.C., *Mysticism: A study and an anthology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.

James, W. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.

Jung, C.G., *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Keirsey, D., *Please Understand Me: 2*, Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis. 1978.

Myers, I.B., & M.H. McCaulley, *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*, Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1985.

Parliament, *Executive summary: 1993 Parliament of the World's Religions*, Chicago, Illinois: Council for the Parliament of the World's Religions, 1993a.

Parliament, *Toward a global ethic: An initial declaration*, Chicago, Illinois: Council for the Parliament of the World's Religions, 1993b.

Ross, C.F.J. 'The intuitive function and religious orientation', in: *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 37 (1992), 83-103.

Ross, C.F.J. 'Jungian typology and religion: A perspective from North America', in: *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 22 (2011), 165-191.

Ross, C., & L.M. Jackson, Orientation to religion and Jungian type preference among Canadian Catholics. (Unpublished paper presented to American Psychological Association Convention, Toronto, 1993).

Ross, C.F., D. Weiss, & L.M. Jackson, 'The relation of Jungian psychological type to

religious attitudes and practices, in: *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 6 (1996), 263-279.

Seager, R.H. 'The two Parliaments, the 1893 original and the centennial of 1993: A historians view', in: W. Teasdale & G. Cairns (Eds). *The community of religions: Voices and images of the Parliament of the World's Religions*, New York: Continuum, 1996, 22-33.

Table 1

Type distribution for participants at the Parliament for the World's Religions, Barcelona, 2004

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences					
ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ	E	<i>n</i> = 265	(45.7%)			
<i>n</i> = 57	<i>n</i> = 45	<i>n</i> = 69	<i>n</i> = 66	I	<i>n</i> = 315	(54.3%)			
(9.8%)	(7.8%)	(11.9%)	(11.4%)	S	<i>n</i> = 249	(42.9%)			
+++++	+++++	+++++	+++++	N	<i>n</i> = 331	(57.1%)			
+++++	+++	+++++	+++++	T	<i>n</i> = 218	(37.6%)			
		++	+	F	<i>n</i> = 362	(62.4%)			
				J	<i>n</i> = 421	(72.6%)			
				P	<i>n</i> = 159	(27.4%)			
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP	Pairs and Temperaments					
<i>n</i> = 7	<i>n</i> = 11	<i>n</i> = 45	<i>n</i> = 15	IJ	<i>n</i> = 237	(40.9%)			
(1.2%)	(1.9%)	(7.8%)	(2.6%)	IP	<i>n</i> = 78	(13.4%)			
+	++	+++++	+++	EP	<i>n</i> = 81	(14.0%)			
		+++		EJ	<i>n</i> = 184	(31.7%)			
				ST	<i>n</i> = 104	(17.9%)			
				SF	<i>n</i> = 145	(25.0%)			
				NF	<i>n</i> = 217	(37.4%)			
				NT	<i>n</i> = 114	(19.7%)			
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP	SJ	<i>n</i> = 211	(36.4%)			
<i>n</i> = 4	<i>n</i> = 16	<i>n</i> = 50	<i>n</i> = 11	SP	<i>n</i> = 38	(6.6%)			
(0.7%)	(2.8%)	(8.6%)	(1.9%)	NP	<i>n</i> = 121	(20.9%)			
+	+++	+++++	++	NJ	<i>n</i> = 210	(36.2%)			
		++++		TJ	<i>n</i> = 181	(31.2%)			
				TP	<i>n</i> = 37	(6.4%)			
				FP	<i>n</i> = 122	(21.0%)			
				FJ	<i>n</i> = 240	(41.4%)			
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ	IN	<i>n</i> = 195	(33.6%)			
<i>n</i> = 36	<i>n</i> = 73	<i>n</i> = 53	<i>n</i> = 22	EN	<i>n</i> = 136	(23.4%)			
(6.2%)	(12.6%)	(9.1%)	(3.8%)	IS	<i>n</i> = 120	(20.7%)			
+++++	+++++	+++++	++++	ES	<i>n</i> = 129	(22.2%)			
+	+++++	++++		ET	<i>n</i> = 73	(12.6%)			
	+++			EF	<i>n</i> = 192	(33.1%)			
				IF	<i>n</i> = 170	(20.3%)			
				IT	<i>n</i> = 145	(25.0%)			
Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		Participants at Parliament for the World's Religions, 2004	
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%		%		
E-TJ	58	10.0	I-TP	22	3.8	Dt.T	80		13.8
E-FJ	126	21.7	I-FP	56	9.7	Dt.F	182		31.4
ES-P	20	3.4	IS-J	102	17.6	Dt.S	122		21.0
EN-P	61	10.5	IN-J	135	23.3	Dt.N	196	33.8	

Note: N = 580 + = 1% of N

Table 2: *Mystical Orientation Scale: correlation coefficients for each item with the rest of test and item endorsement*

	r with rest of test	% important
<i>Ineffability</i>		
experience something I could not put into words	.48	69
feeling moved by a power beyond description	.65	71
being aware of more than I could ever describe	.65	76
<i>Noesis</i>		
sensing God in the beauty of nature	.43	81
knowing I was surrounded by a presence	.57	72
hearing God speak to me	.51	44
<i>Transiency</i>		
brief glimpses into the heart of things	.59	68
transient visions of the transcendental	.65	44
passing moments of divine revelation	.71	53
<i>Passivity</i>		
being overwhelmed by a sense of wonder	.58	70
being in a state of mystery outside my body	.62	31
being grasped by a power beyond my control	.59	34
<i>Oneness</i>		
feeling at one with the universe	.64	67
feeling at one with all living beings	.64	68
sensing the unity in all things	.64	74
<i>Timelessness</i>		
losing a sense of time, place and person	.56	35
being conscious only of timelessness and eternity	.62	40
the merging of past, present and future	.62	44
<i>True ego</i>		
being absorbed within the divine	.73	52
losing my everyday self in a greater being	.72	52
feeling my everyday self absorbed in the depths of being	.71	42

Table 3: *Mean mystical orientation scores by dichotomous preference*

comparisons	N	Mean	SD	F	$p <$
extraversion	259	76.0	17.8	0.7	NS
introversion	308	75.3	17.0		
sensing	238	71.3	18.5	7.4	.001
intuition	329	78.7	15.8		
thinking	213	72.6	17.6	4.8	.001
feeling	354	77.4	17.0		
judging	410	73.6	17.2	7.3	.001
perceiving	157	80.9	16.6		

Table 4: *Mean mystical orientation scores by dominant and auxiliary type preferences*

comparisons	N	Mean	SD	F	$p <$
dominant feeling with intuition	98	80.4	14.9		
dominant thinking with intuition	37	80.3	13.8		
dominant intuition with feeling	119	80.1	16.3		
dominant sensing with feeling	59	77.4	16.2		
dominant intuition with thinking	75	73.5	16.1		
dominant thinking with sensing	41	72.1	19.6		
dominant feeling with sensing	78	69.6	18.7		
dominant sensing with thinking	60	66.9	18.3	7.1	.001